

ALAN WATT BLURB (i.e. Educational Talk):
"PUPPETS, PEARLS AND PALAVER"
FEBRUARY 1, 2007

Dialogue Copyrighted Alan Watt - February 1, 2007
(Exempting Music and Literary Quotes)

WWW.CUTTINGTHROUGHTHEMATRIX.COM

www.alanwattsentientsentinel.eu

Hi folks. I'm Alan Watt and today it is February 1st, 2007.

"Everybody Wants To Rule the World"
By Tears for Fears

Welcome to your life
There's no turning back
Even while we sleep
We will find you
Acting on your best behavior
Turn your back on mother nature
Everybody wants to rule the world

It's my own design
It's my own remorse
Help me to decide
Help me make the most
Of freedom and of pleasure
Nothing ever lasts forever
Everybody wants to rule the world

There's a room where the light won't find you
Holding hands while the walls come tumbling down
When they do I'll be right behind you

So glad we've almost made it
So sad they had to fade it
Everybody wants to rule the world

I thought I would kick off this talk with a speech, or parts of a speech, that **Richard Perle** gave at Oxford University in **2006, June 7th**. This can be found on various sites, but globalresearch.ca has parts of it up, and you can take your pick. I'm sure each one has selected parts from his whole speech, but with Perle, he doesn't hold too many punches, so it doesn't matter what version you read. This particular column kicks off with a quote from Zbigniew Brzezinski.

Now remember how these guys play so many roles. **Zbigniew Brzezinski** was on television. He was the first guy on TV after 9/11, claiming that al-Qaeda—Bin Laden residing in Afghanistan—had brought down the towers, and he said this before the dust had settled. The same man, remember, who amongst the myriad of books he's put out there on global policies, released "***The Grand Chessboard***" a few years before 9/11, with the need to go into the Middle East and take over oil and so on, all that kind of stuff. He is a Council on Foreign Relations guy, Trilateral Commission, and a whole host of other organizations, a big player.

This is a quote from him:

"I think of war with Iran as the ending of America's present role in the world. Iraq may have been a preview of that, but it's still redeemable if we get out fast. In a cold war with Iran, we'll get dragged down for 20 or 30 years. The world will condemn us. We will lose our position in the world." (That was in ***Vanity Fair*** 2006.)

He speaks truth here, and these guys will often speak truth, as they play different sides and swap back and forth to confuse the public, or stir up the public even, because this man wanted this war. The organizations he belongs to have talked about the coming war, for years, and the necessity for having it.

It reminds me of when **Benjamin Franklin (the high Mason that he was)** came out of the Conventional Meeting for the Constitution, and spoke to the "lowly people," the public, who are barred from getting in, while the Masons put it together for them. When he was asked, "what kind of government have you given us?" he said, "***a republic if you can keep it.***" I'm sure he said it with a little smile on his face; because he was well aware of the real role that America was deemed to play. It's the same thing with Brzezinski, as he talks out of two sides of his mouth.

To continue with the article on Richard Perle, it goes on to say:

"One US carrier task force is already in position in the Persian Gulf. Two more task forces are moving swiftly to take up their positions in the Iranian theatre. The controversial neo-conservative American bureaucrat, Richard Perle, visited Britain on the eve of the papal audience between Prime Minister Tony Blair and Pope Benedict XVI. Earlier in the same week, the Iranian Nobel Laureate for Peace, Dr. Shirin Ebadi, was in Britain to voice her concerns about a confrontation between the west and Iran. In London, Metropolitan Police swooped down on two suspected Islamist terrorists believed to be in the process of building a chemical bomb. Summertime tensions are building."

Alan: There are always these little things, supposedly happening, when these meetings are going on. At least we're told this, to get the tension raised. It gives more credence to the meetings about terrorism.

"In bland remarks delivered to a small audience of students at the Oxford Union, Richard Perle outlined the Bush administration's response to the crisis of 9/11 and the neo-conservative doctrines of pre-emptive war."

Alan: Pre-emptive war is taking the right to attack a people on the suspicion that they might bode ill will towards you, in the near future.

"In a droning monotone designed to anaesthetize his keen academic audience, Perle explained the need for an invincible American military apparatus and a foreign policy predicated on the Bush Doctrine of pre-emptive war permitting direct and simultaneous interventions into multiple theatres."

Alan: "Multiple theatres." Really, it's not just different techniques of waging the war, which it does—that's part of it, but it's also multiple fronts if need be. We know the history of those who have taken on more than one or two fronts at the most. It's no surprise to find you overextend yourself and ultimately you're vanquished.

"While Perle stated his hope that the need for military interventions would be minimal, he left the impression that his definition of excessive use of military power might well differ from that of the average American or European citizen. Perle is on the public record advocating pre-emptive strikes against North Korea, Syria, Iran and a list of other countries. Some of his critics accuse Perle of darkly malignant machinations." (That was reported in Sourcewatch)

Alan: Continuing.

"Citing Iraq as a glowing example of an obvious need for direct intervention, Perle admitted that he had long advocated military solutions for regime change in that theatre. In his talk, he reminded us that President Bush had launched the invasion on the basis of several triggering factors, including Nigerian yellow cake..."

Alan: I guess that's some kind of poison of some kind.

"WMDs, terrorist connections, democracy-building and humanitarian issues."

Alan: I love that humanitarian one, where we're going to blow people up for humanitarian reasons.

"Thus, Perle was finally reduced to justifying the Iraq War as a humanitarian crusade – a theme that struck hollow in the midst of reports of civil war, torture and US war crimes against innocent civilians in Haditha. Questioned by a largely supportive audience of admiring students willing to attend a late lecture on a Friday night, Perle touched upon the diplomacy between the West and Iran in the most insipid terms he could muster. Taking into account the latest diplomatic developments, he gave his Oxford audience the impression that the outcome remains obscure in spite of the fact that he is one of the principle architects – and the sternest – of the Iran negotiations. Perle emphasized that President Ahmadinejad holds fanatical religious beliefs involving the necessity for an Armageddonite conflict to trigger the return of the Hidden Imam at the end of the world, in the Shiite tradition for the Last Judgement and the Islamic Apocalypse."

Alan: Once again, they dig up the old stuff, which you can find in every religion,

and bring it to the surface, and paint the followers as raging fanatics. That can be done with every, every religion.

"Perle singled out the fanaticism of Islamic terrorism as the most serious threat to international security, and he praised the Israeli air-strike against Saddam's nuclear reactor in 1981 as a model of pre-emptive military intervention. In his view, the threat of precision air-strikes against the nuclear infrastructure of Iran constitute the best negotiating option."

Alan: This makes me wonder; because this is all about the nuclear reactors that Iran has been working on. It's so interesting to watch how India was allowed to get atomic weapons. Their archenemy, supposedly, Pakistan was also allowed to have it, but for some reason Iran can't, because they're trying to bring on the Apocalypse. What's even more amazing, precision air strikes against a nuclear reactor is going to cause incredible leakage all over. Goodness knows what size of an area; it might go around the world, in fact—if you remember the Chernobyl nuclear reactor meltdown. So how can you possibly have an air strike against a nuclear reactor, safely? It's impossible. It looks to me like Perle, this Perle of wisdom here, would rather bring on the Armageddon. Then again, it could all be theater to terrify the whole planet into going along to a new way of living.

Continuing:

"An Iranian student asked Perle whether he considered the Mearsheimer and Walt paper, "The Israel Lobby," to be, "anti-Semitic." Castigating the eighty-five page paper as, "bad scholarship," Perle admitted that he did not know what he was talking about when he confessed that he had not read it in its entirety. This question put Perle on the defensive, and he asserted that there was no secret agenda amongst America's plethora of, "Jewish groups," that sought to place the national security of Israel above that of the United States.

In the limited time available, no one was able to follow up Perle's pregnant point about the non-existence of a secret agenda with a question about the Israeli spy scandal that shook his own office at the Pentagon, when Larry Franklin was discovered to be the conduit between the Office of Special Plans and two Israeli officials, who were later identified as espionage agents assigned to the embassy. Neither was he questioned about the incident that took place in 1970, when an FBI wiretap revealed that Perle discussed classified intelligence with an official at the Israeli embassy. Washington insiders have long considered Perle to be, "an Israeli agent of influence. Another fact fuels these suspicions swirling around Perle, since he serves as a director of Hollinger International which owns the Jerusalem Post."

Alan: That was Conrad Black's newspaper. Conrad Black of Canada, who was subsequently made Lord Conrad Black by the Queen.

"Perle has been paid millions for his "work" for Hollinger even though he is the only 'outside' director on the Executive Committee. Perle's complicated business dealings have brought him under suspicion for conflicts of interest, and the charge that he is attempting to profit from wars that he was strenuously working to create and implement, through his official capacity in the Department

of Defense. In 2004, Perle's conflicts of interest resulted in his resignation from the Defense Policy Board.

When a perceptive student asked about his preferences for the next president of the United States, Perle made some riveting remarks. He immediately stated his hope that Senator Joseph Lieberman would be the Democratic candidate. Failing that miracle, Perle hopes former Governor Mark Warner will win the Democratic nomination. Perle warmly praised both right-leaning Democrats who are doyens of the Democratic Leadership Council. Richard Giuliani is Perle's favourite Republican. When asked about potential presidential candidates who would cause him concern, Perle swiftly reeled off a long list of Democrats led by Governor Howard Dean, followed closely by Senator John Kerry, former Vice President Al Gore, former Senator John Edwards, and he finished his list of neo-conservative hate figures with a revealing comment about Senator Hillary Clinton."

Alan: I don't what could be more revealing than what's already been revealed.

"It is hardly secret that Senator Clinton has attempted to appeal to the Israeli right. When she visited Israel, she condemned the Palestinians, but Perle was not impressed. Quite the contrary, Perle said that while she had made some smart moves in her attempt to appeal to the right, the left did not believe her."

Alan: That gives impetus to "not let your left hand know what you're right hand is doing."

"This comment gave the clear impression that Perle did not believe her, either. Criticizing other Democrats, Perle said that Senator John Kerry, "did not understand power," and was not able to perform the duties of the president of America. In his form of damnation by faint praise, Perle said that Howard Dean was a much nicer man off the podium than on it - and he gave him pride of place at the top of his most worrisome Democratic politicians.

The love affair between Perle's base in Likud on the hard line Israeli right and the neo-conservatives of both US political parties is alive and kicking. Perle has long been associated with Likud that has been reduced to a weak rump huddling around Benjamin Netanyahu in the new Knesset. As a close associate of Netanyahu, Perle is seen as Likud's top-ranking advocate in Europe and America, with his tentacles into both political parties, the Bush White House, the Pentagon and many other leading institutions. Next year, it would not be surprising to find Perle's name on contributors lists to Giuliani, Lieberman and Warner."

Alan: The man should get a prize for having so many disguises and faces. He's outdone Brahma with his amount of faces, this man. Who does he really, really work for? One thing is sure. It will never be the obvious. That's why it's being made obvious.

"The morning after his Oxford talk, Perle appeared on the very influential BBC radio programme, 'Today,' where he was interviewed by John Humphries, the ranking heavyweight commentator in Britain. Admitting President Bush's political weakness, Perle made a revealing comment when Humphries pressed him on US plans to bomb Iran. When Humphries pointed out that a unilateral US

bombardment of Iran would be greeted with global howls of derision, Perle said, "No American president who believes that there is a last opportunity to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state is going to be deterred by derision. He will do what he believes to be in the best interests of the protection of those who might come under attack from an Iranian nuclear weapon, including the United States." (That was on 'Today,' BBC4, 3rd June 2006)

"When Humphries pressed him harder by pointing out that the former British Foreign Secretary, Jack Straw..."

Alan: You know the straw man.

"... had termed the US bombing of Iran, "inconceivable," Perle shot back with a revealing retort. "Well, it's no longer conceivable that he's the Foreign Secretary." Humphries then asked whether Straw had been sacked over his offence, putting Perle on the spot by asking, "You think there's a link there?" Perle replied,

"I don't know. He was expressing a view that the government had not concluded yet in a way that diminished the leverage to produce a political result, a diplomatic result. That's obviously unwise."

"This response left the clear impression that Straw had been removed specifically because he had ridiculed Washington's negotiating position, and that Perle had been intimately involved in ordering and engineering the surprise sacking. While Perle was undergoing his public interrogation before six million listeners on the BBC, Tony Blair was entering the Vatican for his long-awaited audience..."

Alan: I was going to say "sentence" there.

"...audience with Pope Benedict XVI. Blair's last papal audience occurred in early 2003 shortly before the launch of the Iraq War, when he pleaded with the late pontiff. John Paul II, to support the Crusade..."

Alan: A crusade, again.

"...against Islamist terrorism."

Alan: Oh, a crusade, a Holy Crusade. It's interesting terminology coming to the fore. Tony Blair, remember, has been in every other religion. He's been into see voodoo priests and everything else. So I don't see what seeing the pope does. I guess he has to play all the tunes for all the different peoples.

"The German Pope has been a strident critic of, "fundamentalist terror..."

Alan: This is the Vatican, talking about fundamentalist terror—what a history.

"...the Vatican's code term for Islamism. According to the published accounts, Blair and the pope discussed the current negotiations with Iran. The Sunday Times reported, "Pope Benedict XVI pressed Tony Blair to find a diplomatic resolution to the Iran nuclear crisis." The Pope is more than well aware of the escalation of the military planning on both sides. There can be little serious doubt that George Bush had given Tony Blair his marching orders"

Alan: This thing continues with a lot of speculation and little bits and pieces, and it's intended to heighten the tensions in the world. Perle is no dummy, and Perle can only say what he's told he can say to the world, because these characters were set up long ago as a separate organization, almost a separate people, really. They don't go by Judaism, although they'll play all sides. At the top they'll play all sides. The old saying "when in Rome" applies here. Perle and all these characters that created the New American Century club, got permission to do it, by Britain, because the U.S. was meant to take over from Britain, and it has been doing that since really World War I. That was the intent and it has the blessings of Britain. That's the special relationship that different prime ministers keep talking about between the U.S. and Britain, this "special relationship."

This is an ongoing agenda, a very old one. They must get the crowds, all different sects of crowds, following them, so they make sure they give us the leaders to follow. Then the people will condemn—every mob condemns the other mob, and then you have chaos stirred up. When you have enough bloodshed, chaos, fear and terror, you come out with the solutions.

It's interesting to see that around the late 1800's, Revelations in the New Testament suddenly took different twists. Something, which was really, almost a second class or third class bunch of scripture, came to the forefront, deliberately so, with the creation of the authorized British Israeli or British Israel movement. This was the doctrine that the British people were really the lost tribes, or comprised some of the lost tribes. All this stuff came out of secret service committees, on how to control the empire and even expand the empire into a global empire. They found that by reinterpreting Revelations, they could convince followers. At that time, there were quite a lot of people who believed in their given religions. You could convince the followers that this was a natural thing, that Britain's empire taking over the world. Then they've got their branches set up in America, because America they knew would have to take over, because of more manpower, more industry, more space and could put up more factories, and they would become the policemen of the world.

We have the admissions of people at the top, who went into Lebanon after World War I, such as [Storr], who said, "we have created an ouster in a hostile country," talking about putting a new Israel in amongst the Arabs. Now who is "we"? Because [Storr] was talking on behalf of the Crown, the Empire.

Looking back over history, this is nothing new, this ploy of putting in a people into a territory as either a buffer, or to stir up tensions down the road, whereby you could use as an excuse for going in to save somebody, one or the other side or whoever.

In ancient times, whole peoples were moved off their land at times. Not so much ancient, either, when we look at places like the Highland clearances of Scotland from the 1700's into the 1800s. Millions of people were just pushed off the land, put in boats and dumped overseas, by orders of the Crown. That which they make very obvious will ensure the hate will build up, and that's what it's intended to do.

The reasons that we can be fooled, over and over, by the same techniques, are because we are so well conditioned, and so well understood, by those who have

access to tremendous sciences of human nature. The representatives we see near the top in the public view, may dawn prayer shawls or they may bow down to popes, or like Mr. Blair, pop in to see voodoo priests. It's all a charade, because those people at the top, on all sides, don't believe in the myths of the old religions. They all belong to their own religion. Every person at the top of every side belongs to a single religion. That's why they plan the future. That's why they never retire. That's why they're just as fanatical at 80 years of age, as they were when they were 25. They also are brought up to their own stature, and power or sphere of influence, by pre-existent authorities.

You don't make your way up through the world by blasting a hole through the ozone layer of society and money and power. If you are not allowed up, you wouldn't get up. You'd be shot down, halfway up. That's the reality of the world we live in. The players we see are carefully chosen to play their parts on the world stage, because it's the masses they must fool. It's not each other they must fool. They're all very high ranking Freemasons, way above the nonsense you'll read about on your local bookstore shelves, put out as PR about freemasonry, way above that. These are true believers, true believers in a very old esoteric religion, and that's why they never retire. It's the only time you'll see such dedication, on all supposed sides, from the old men at the top. The only time you'll see that is in a religion, and it's not the religions for the exoteric masses.

Unfortunately, the masses have accepted the identity they've been born with, the culture they've been born into. Then they've had their indoctrinations to make them blend into the mass—they're assigned the mass; and because of that they could be counted on to behave exactly as the elite want them to behave, at certain times, when they press the button. This bunch is off to kill that bunch et cetera, et cetera. It's the same arguments, over and over, until it's monotonous.

Religion has never given the opportunity to allow an individual to find their true potential in this world, or who they are. **The function of religion is to control the minds of the followers.** That's why they're "authorized religions." The conflicts will go on and on, until this great work is achieved.

Albert Pike, who wrote "***Morals & Dogma***," which was considered to be the Bible of Freemasonry, said it himself, he said, "We could just as easily have taken the writings of Xerxes or some other ancient builder." The reason they took the Old Testament as a form of foundation, was simply because most people in the west were Christianized. They could relate to some of the stories, but they could have picked any ancient builder, or a Persian king, and he admits that.

This religion pre-existed most of our given history. When the pharaohs, for instance, were very young, the priests would educate them in how to maintain and hold power over the people, over the masses. These were sciences which were known thousands of years ago, and it's based on the understanding of human behavior, especially mass human behavior, and because of that they can bring on conflict at any time they wish. It's a simple formula.

In pre-Christian Rome, the Romans, who taxed every country that they went into—they robbed it, they pillaged it and really did drain the countries—to keep Rome itself living in an incredible luxury and style so advanced, compared to the countries they conquered and looted. Yet their own historians tongue-and-cheek

would let slip little bits and pieces, being "**authorized historians.**" No different from today. They'd tell you that they were looting the countries that they went into, under the guise of bringing civilization to them. "Civilization," and here's Perle using similar terminology today. Just simple formulas, where you demonize a people you want to take over, and bring this strange odd thing called "democracy" to them. The people are fighting over democracy, with their left wings and their right wings, and their left foets and right foets, and their left eye and right eyes. It's very, very schizophrenic, indeed; but they can't figure it out.

When I was really small, I noticed, by simply reading from the adult libraries, that the organizations such as the Royal Institute of International Affairs were predicting the future, in their own publications. As I grew up, I noticed that regardless of what wing they put in, left wing or a chicken wing, this agenda, sure enough, carried forth, this bringing of democracy to the world. You cannot get people to change their culture or traditional lifestyle, quickly, without violence. It's obvious these characters, who are forcing this agenda, are going on a "business plan." It's a business plan, you see, with times, dates, money spent, time spent on certain parts of their project, the Great Builders. They want to bring this "humanitarian" war to a close, and we'll have the same standardized system worldwide—how monotonous.

There's nothing perfect in any culture, since if we look back at the cultures and their systems, that they all have so much in common to do with beginnings. One family, that's maybe a bit taller or more aggressive than the rest, simply conquer their neighbors and take them over, and before you know it they own a county. They own an area, and then they own, ultimately, a country through violence. The aggressive ones, they end up being after one or two generations of ritual and propaganda, they end up being set in the mind-set of the people as somehow portraying their tribe. The pinnacle of your tribe, in fact, forgetting how they started off through mass slaughter, murder and stealing. Therefore, their gang gets to be the one on top.

Down through history they have other gangs come along, and sometimes a new gang will take over, and they become accepted by the people, after a couple of generations, as though they'd always been there, and we watch pageantry and ritual. What you're looking at now is a battle of gangs, and there's no doubt about it. All cultures have their top elite gang on top that run the whole show, so naturally they're not going to like it too much if someone wants to take away their takings, the place where they get their takings from—their lifestyle, their prominence, their power, their status, their income.

It always struck me as odd that, that which you could see in a playground at schools, between competitive gangs, wasn't seen in the supposed acceptable forms of leading families, pre-eminent families, very wealthy families, because that's how they got their beginnings. That's how they held on to their power, by being completely and utterly ruthless. **The deviants are in control and have been, down through the centuries.** Money made it much, much more easy for them to take over, money. Rome did it too. They forced the people they conquered to accept money, and then they taxed it back from them, and then paid them back in money, to build for them and work for them. It's a merry-go-round. It's a concept, a strange concept, which most folk accept, but never understand.

I'm surprised that some of the biggest betting shops in England are not, and they might actually be doing it, because they do put bets on the wars and so on, to see which gang wins, **THE GANG OF THE WORLD**. They'll recruit thousands of professors and writers to convince us, very quickly, how naturally it all is, how natural the gang is in place, and how much better off we are. The ancient kings were very good at that kind of thing. How they "built cities," as they said, using slave labor. However, without the participation of the brainwashed on all factions, who are willing to kill each other for people they will never ever see, except on television, the ones that tell us to go off and do this, and do that, and kill.

WITHOUT OUR PARTICIPATION, NONE OF THIS WOULD BE POSSIBLE.

Once again, the understanding of human nature is used.

You'll notice that at least 20 years pass between major wars, and that is because by that time, those that were crippled or often dead from the last war, the new generations have forgotten all about it. The ones growing up to be recruited, for the next war, know nothing about it. They think it's all glory and wonder, and each one wants to be the hero of his tribe. When he puts on that uniform, he'll be just like Rambo, when he can go off and slaughter millions and just yell as he's got that big machine gun hanging there—something that weighs about half a ton, around his neck. The fantasy of it all, the tribal nature, which is utilized and understood to the full, works over and over again.

Have you ever noticed, that as you watch these conflicts being manipulated, and how the peoples naturally withdraw into their own group, as if on queue, a natural response, again? Have you ever noticed, as they quote God, and all sides quote God, you see, that God is very quiet in the matter? We need the people to tell us what God is thinking, and they do. They tell us what God is thinking or what God wants. God is a generic term. Every ancient god in the past was called "God," and that's no coincidence. That's the general term that's used. Yes, we know that certain religions have their own secret word for God, deriving from the ancient times in the Arabian lands, because knowing the name of a god meant the god had to serve you, you had the power over the genie. The genie came out of the bottle, and I often think the guys must have drunk the bottle first, before they saw the genie. Yet we have all these people, with all their fancy dresses on, telling us what God wants. God's on our side, eh?

The irony of war after war after war, and masses of slaughter, manipulated by very clever people, who all coerced together to bring these things around, and how the public respond like robots when the tribal button is pushed. People who would never, in ordinary life, without conflict, they'd never think of going and killing somebody, suddenly wanting to do it. The young men want to do it. The older ones don't. That's why they don't recruit older people for the military. They go after the young people around 18, very immature, you see. They don't know any better. The movies have had tremendous effects on their minds. They think they're indestructible.

And to top it off, we have the admissions, down through the years, of the chemical tampering that's going on with troops to make them more aggressive. The new anti-malarial drugs that were given, even to Canadian troops, and some of which caused hallucinations, while they were on duty in Somalia, and there's a CBC documentary on that. The one guy said it was just like walking through rainbows,

and at one time he pulled a gun out to a child's head and pointed it, just for the fun of it. It seemed very funny at the time.

When they don that uniform they belong privately. They've sold themselves. That's why they can be experimented on. That's why the cultures that had the elders, which gave wisdom and kept the balance between the very young and the other age groups. That's why the elderly have been discredited, and the families destroyed, because they certainly did not want older people to have input into a young person's mind. They might just put them off putting on a military uniform and going off to kill, for reasons they don't even question. That's another sad part of it. They're not interested in political strategies. They're not even interested in their long term political goals, or who benefits, and which families benefit through the financial scams that we see going on, because war is very, very profitable.

The average mercenary trooper—and all peacetime soldiers are mercenaries—doesn't concern himself with that. He wants to be a hero. He wants to be accepted by his peer group, with honor, and get little tin badges and little ribbons, because deep down he suspects that in his life when he goes back to city streets, he's not going to get any respect at all. He'll probably get a low-pay job, and have nothing but repetitive boring stories to tell people.

I've watched the people at Remembrance Day (some call it Veteran's Day) in Canada and Britain, with these old codgers that dress up with their blazers, their blue blazers or black blazers, and their little berets on, and try and march along (the old guys from World War II and Korea). They all cry when they tell their stories, and so on and so on. However, because of the bonding they felt under the threat of their lives—you're talking about an increased bonding, because of a survival instinct that was pressed to the full—they feel like they have never lived after the particular war they were in. Their mind, in a sense, stopped right there. The rest of their life has been anti-climax of basic drudgery, and that's a sad statement, and yet they'll encourage the young, those guys will encourage the young to go off and do the same.

The abused always seem to go to the abuser for help, in this particular system, the value system. The value system of what?—Where a few hundred families on the planet, down through the ages, with various titles and honors and so on, can control the rest?

THE REASON THEY CAN CONTROL THE REST IS THAT MOST PEOPLE ARE AFRAID OF RISK-TAKING.

They conform, **CON-FORM** - the priest's form. **They're CON-FORMED, SHAPED.** They're scared to go against the grain, because the other robots will look at them strangely. That's where people are until they wake up and have that spark to find out what's going on. That spark has to flare up into a real flame, and get through all the nonsense that's there to trap you, and all the finger pointing with traditional enemies to mislead you.

THE REASON FAMILIES HAVE NEVER LOST POWER, DOWN THROUGH THE MANY, MANY CENTURIES, IS BECAUSE THEY'VE ALWAYS GOT SOMEONE ELSE TO BE THE SCAPEGOAT, ALWAYS.

The public, who don't think too far ahead, will jump always on the offered scapegoat—a sad commentary on the world. Those with memory will remember all of the snippets of information from the "**covert wars**," as they were called, going on all over the world, Latin America and elsewhere, where everyone's involved, the special forces of all the western powers.

The quiet killings—quiet that is, for those who were living pretty well in Europe and North America, who didn't hear the screams as their tax money pounded and slaughtered, often from the air. Being told about it doesn't impact most people. They have no empathy for anyone outside their own family. That's a sad state of affairs, but that's what we have today. There's no cohesiveness and natural bonding between peoples. Divide and conquer, right down to the individual, and that's when the State reigns supreme, when everyone is conquered and separated.

I'll leave you tonight with a Canadian singer, who wrote this song after visiting some Latin American countries, and how he expressed what he felt about what was happening, the promotion of wars, by the big military powers, on peasantry.

For myself and Hamish, it's good night, and please, take your gods with you.

"If I Had A Rocket Launcher" **By Bruce Cockburn**

Here comes the helicopter -- second time today
Everybody scatters and hopes it goes away
How many kids they've murdered only God can say
If I had a rocket launcher, If I had a rocket launcher,
If I had a rocket launcher...I'd make somebody pay

I don't believe in guarded borders and I don't believe in hate
I don't believe in generals or their stinking torture states
And when I talk with the survivors, of things too sickening to relate
If I had a rocket launcher, If I had a rocket launcher,
If I had a rocket launcher...I would retaliate

On the Rio Lacantun, one hundred thousand wait
To fall down from starvation -- or some less humane fate
Cry for Guatemala, with a corpse in every gate
If I had a rocket launcher, If I had a rocket launcher,
If I had a rocket launcher...I would not hesitate

I want to raise every voice -- at least I've got to try
Every time I think about it, water rises to my eyes.
Situation desperate, echoes of the victims cry
If I had a rocket launcher, If I had a rocket launcher,
If I had a rocket launcher...Some son of a bitch would die